

FILED

JUN 20 2008

CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CASBN 44332)
United States Attorney

BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973)
Chief, Criminal Division

ROBERT N. MICHAELS (PABN 200918)
Special Assistant United States Attorney

Defense Language Institute – Criminal Law
1336 Plummer Street, Building 275
Monterey, CA 93944
Telephone: (831) 242-4537
FAX: (831) 242-5198

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SALINAS DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	Criminal No.: CR-08-00257 PVT
)	
Plaintiff,)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
vs.)	
)	
TORY G. CARPENTER,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

On June 2, 2008, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status hearing. The parties jointly requested that the case be continued from June 2, 2008, until August 4, 2008 at 9:30 a.m., in order to allow time for defendant's counsel to prepare for the case. In addition, the parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act, from June 2, 2008 to August 4, 2008 at 9:30 a.m. The parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of counsel.

1 SO STIPULATED:

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
United States Attorney

4 DATED: 5 June 2008

5 /S/
ROBERT N. MICHAELS
Special Assistant United States Attorney

7 DATED:

8 /S/
NICK HUMY
Counsel for SANTILLAN

10 ORDER

11 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded
12 under the Speedy Trial Act from June 2, 2008 to August 4, 2008. The Court finds, based on the
13 aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice are served by granting the requested continuance
14 and outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to
15 grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for
16 effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a
17 miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made
18 under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

19 SO ORDERED.

20 DATED: 6/20/08

21 
RICHARD SEEBORG
United States Magistrate Judge